



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

will only mention one very simple correction, which relates to xli. 6, 7 and xl. 20. I had myself pointed out in 1880 that something must have dropped out of the text between xl. 19 and 20. Duhm now makes it clear that the missing passage is xli. 6, 7, which has no natural connection whatever with its present context. This is a great improvement on the suggestions of Oort (*Tijdschr.*, 1886, page 310; 1891, page 463) and Abbott (*Essays*, 1891, page 222), that xli. 6, 7 should come *after* verse 20; the order is now the same as in xliv. 12, etc.—first the metal image, then the wooden one.

Duhm's book is one which gains from further study, and if the author is in some points (seized upon directly by more cautious scholars) strangely wilful, let us be thankful that there is still something to do for future investigators. For the more we study the great writers of antiquity the deeper do they appear, and the larger the problems which they suggest.

T. K. CHEYNE.

The Sacred Books of the Old Testament.

A Critical Edition of the Hebrew Text, Printed in Colours. With Notes.

The Book of Job. By C. SIEGFRIED. Leipzig and Baltimore. 1893.

THE publication of Siegfried's reconstruction of the text of Job marks an era in the history of Bible criticism. It is true that the old ideas in regard to the inspiration of the *word* of Scripture have been gradually driven back by the philological criticism which has been applied to the Hebrew text. Few even of the most determined orthodox critics (if such a combination be really possible) will for a moment now assert that the whole of the Old Testament has come down to our day as it left the hands of its authors. We have all become accustomed to see corrections suggested in books and articles; to hear them spoken of from the platform of the lecture-room. We have even seen the critical results of scholars' works embodied in translations of portions of the Bible, as in Addis', Bacon's, or Kautzsch-Socin's renderings of Genesis. But a certain measure of sanctity still adhered to the Hebrew original. Here could be seen the last vestiges of the old ideas in which so many of us were brought up. Suggestions might be *advanced* and changes *proposed*; but to *make* such changes in the actual Hebrew text was little short of ungodliness.

Though it be with a little heart-rending, let us be thankful that the incubus is raised, that the last vestiges of so false a veneration are quietly passing away. With the passing of the false will come the advent of the true. As we learn to know better the words of our old masters, we shall be able to appreciate them the more. If the old letter killed, let the new bring in fresh life, and quicken us with its truth, as even the old quickened those that have gone before us.

For the last fifty years a vast amount of labour has been earnestly and reverently expended upon the study of the Hebrew Bible. A literature has grown up greater than that on any other book or collection of books. Scattered in out-of-the-way places, oftentimes in serial publications which are not accessible even to scholars, it is high time that all this accumulation should be gathered together and brought to a focus. Our own day has seen such masterly compendia as Brugmann's *Comparative Grammar of the Indo-Germanic Languages*, and Iwan Müller's *Handbuch der Klassischen Alterthumswissenschaft*.

The work, of which this volume is Part XVII., attempts, with a somewhat similar purpose, to present the resultant Hebrew text as it has come out of the study of the Biblical critics, both "high" and "low." We are indebted to Professor Haupt, not only for the plan of the whole series, but also for the care which has been given even to the minutest details of the typographical work. The list of coadjutors is enough assurance that ripe scholarship and a wide sympathy will attend the decision of the many knotty questions which such an edition calls forth. I may be permitted in this REVIEW to deplore the fact, which is made so manifest in the list itself, that so few of our own men—ours in a peculiar sense—have devoted their energies to the scientific elucidation of the Bible. Who more readily than the Jew ought to be in the first ranks of those who seek to make his literature intelligible "to the Jew first, and also to the Greek"?

This is not an *édition définitive*. He who expects to find such will be in sad error; for such is impossible. One has but to think of the many pre-editorial questions which have hardly been properly stated, let alone answered. We use the versions promiscuously—when it pleases us only. Think of the life-work of Lagarde—just blossoming when the tree that bore it was cut down! Think of the questions which are involved every time we open our Septuagint! How little has been done for the Targumim! Still less for the Peshitta! Was it really outside the charmed circle of LXX. influence, as Rahlfs (*contre moi*) would have us believe? These questions, and many others, need answers before anything *definitive* can be established. But while waiting, while plodding onward, we can stop from time to time, and make up accounts. We can see where we stand, and how

far we have travelled. Such an accounting we are to get, I take it, in Professor Haupt's edition of the Sacred Books of the Old Testament.

The formal arrangement of the text in the part before us will in general commend itself at once. The resultant original text is printed black upon a white ground ; while "parallel compositions," "polemical interpolations," and "correcting interpolations," are distinguished by a coloured background. This colouring is done by a new process, the invention of Professor Haupt. The process has turned out very successfully. The black type shows clearly through the colouring, which is sufficiently distinct to bring out the character of the passages so marked. All changes made in the text are carefully noted as such, so that the student is never in doubt whether he is following the Masoretic or the emended reading.

The text itself has been left unvocalized except in passages which are supposed to contain unusual forms or verbal corrections. It is worth more than a passing thought, whether such a course is advisable. We, who are acquainted with the text, shall readily find it again, "undressed," as it is here. But is it not liable to become a "Valley of dry bones" to the student?—and his needs, it is stated, have been expressly consulted. A prose text can be so read with great ease. But who would venture to attack al-Nabigha, Imrulkais, or Abu Tamurâm, when not carefully guarded with a sufficient quantity of strokes and dots? The comparison is lame, no doubt. We are loth to speak of Job as evident poetry ; and yet it is certainly that to a very large extent.

Excellent as is the arrangement, two inconsistencies have struck me somewhat forcibly ; and no word seems to be said in explanation. The Elihu speeches are polemical interpolations, and therefore—the colour is very expressive—have been printed green. That was surely sufficient to brand them for ever. But they are also relegated to the back of the book ; and completely released from the remotest connection with the Masoretic text. Such a deplacement may be wise and proper. But why is the same not done with chap. xxviii.—in fact, with all the interpolations, for whatever cause they may have been inserted? Is it because the Elihu speeches are large in extent, and form in a measure a connected whole? Can this be a sufficient criterion? And then, below the text are found numerous notes containing parts of the Masoretic text which are supposed not to belong to the original poem. In four places such *marginalia* are even coloured. For what reason are they relegated to the margin? Is it because they are too small in extent? But several of them are longer than the parallel compositions xii. 4-7, or the correcting interpolation xxi.

16-18—both of which are allowed to remain in the body of the text. On page 49 these *marginalia* are said to be later interpolations. Does Siegfried really mean that he can so distinguish a difference of time? "Later" than what time? And were all the other changes and interpolations made at one time?

The evident idea is to give to the reader a picture of the original work, in so far as it can now be reconstructed. Where is such a reconstruction to be found in this edition of Job? One has to pick one's way, continually jumping over obstacles in various colours, which effectually prevent one from getting a clear idea of how the text originally read. Would it not have answered the purpose better to have divided each page into two columns; to have placed in the right-hand column the reconstructed text just as the editor imagines that it came from the author's hand? The left-hand column might then have been reserved for the interpolations and additions, which, being thus placed opposite the respective portions they were meant to correct or add to, would be brought into strong contrast with these passages. If the eye is to be brought into requisition, let it have full scope to do its work well!

In the "Critical Notes," I find the citation of passages by page and line most confusing. We are accustomed to cite by chapter and verse—which enumeration is also to be found here at the top of the page. As it is in heavy type, it catches the eye. Eye and usage bring one thus into everlasting conflict with the notes. Perhaps a slight change in this respect, might be made in the following parts.

I have mentioned the poetic form in which the Book of Job is clothed. Siegfried seems also of this opinion, for the text is arranged "in lines of double columns." Is this, then, the only division which a poetical composition calls for? Was the idea of verse entirely strange to the Hebrew mind? It may be that neither Ley, nor Merx, nor Briggs, nor Bickell, have written a real *Poetica* of the old Hebrew. If Siegfried does not see his way towards accepting any of the proposed systems, why make any break whatsoever in the different speeches, which themselves form natural breaks in the discourse? (Bickell). Was ever poetry written with such unevenness in the number of the *στίχοι*? Yet we find here in chap. iii. 20+18+14; in chaps. iv.-vii. 11+6+11+20+18+22. Is this at all likely?

Turning now to the text itself, we see everywhere the careful hand of Professor Siegfried. He seems to have made use of the best and latest commentaries; though I am surprised to find that Hoffmann's *Hiob* (Kiel, 1891) does not figure in the notes. Though at times violent in his attempt to restore the Massoretic consonant text to its

former position, and to find some sort of intelligent connection between parts which are the evident work of other hands, Hoffmann has some clever suggestions which are well worth being cited. Of Bickell's *Kritische Bearbeitung des Job-Dialogs* in the *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes*, Vols. VI. and VII., Siegfried could probably not avail himself (see also the article of Bickell in the *Zeitschrift für Katholische Theologie*, 1886, pp. 557 sq.).

This mention of Bickell (to which that of Hatch ought to be added, *Essays in Biblical Greek*, pp. 215 sq.), raises a question of the utmost moment in the treatment of the text of Job. Siegfried's notes evidence a good use of the LXX. But they show also an uncritical and promiscuous use of this LXX. material. It is a well-known fact that our best LXX. manuscripts of Job contain a mixed text—a text made up of the old LXX. plus the additions taken by Origen from Theodotion. Even though the Sahidic version was not accessible, there are two Greek, two Latin and one Syriac manuscript, by means of which these additions can be separated from the original. In a critical edition of a Greek or Latin classic, would it be permissible to do as Siegfried has done (and with him all former commentators)—to cite as G. (Septuagint) that which is G+T (Theodotion)?

This is not attempting the *definitive*, of which I spoke above. The new edition does not accurately represent the possible text which may be obtained with the means now at our disposal. Lagarde had in 1884 (*Mittheilungen*, i., pp. 200 sq.), pointed out the importance of the Coptic *Fragmenta Borgiana* as the only living representative of the pre-Origen text of the LXX. to Job. This pre-Origen text contained several hundred verses less than the Hebrew *textus receptus*. It is true, the question as to the relation existing between the Masoretic and the original Septuagint is one of the most difficult of the many problems which confront the Old Testament critic. But it is a question which no one can afford to disregard entirely. Anyone who has read carefully Dillon's translation of Bickell's reconstruction (*Contemporary Review*, July, 1893, *The Original Poem of Job*), can hardly fail to see that it reads well; it is clear and intelligible, not only in its individual sentences, but especially in the logical flow of the argument. Would it be well, then, to replace the Masoretic by the pre-Origen Greek text; as H. H. Howorth has recently tried to do with other books of the Bible (*Academy*, 16th September, 1893, etc.)? Hardly. The pre-Origen text itself has its own peculiar history. It already contains, *e.g.*, the Elihu discourse, the description of the B^hēmōth, Chapter xv. 20-22, etc., etc. Professor Bickell, in his forthcoming

larger work, will no doubt enlighten us on this subject. Does it not seem that there were two recensions current in olden times—a longer and a shorter one? If it be possible, in a critical edition the Hebrew reconstruction of the shorter recension ought to find a place in a continuous note running below the Masoretic (or longer) recension. Would not such a consideration as this effectually negative the late date assigned to the composition of the book by some critics? (König, *Einleitung in das Alte Testament* § 85, 3). Am I right in inferring from p. 34 note 17 that Siegfried places the date of the composition of Job in the Maccabæan period? Cheyne has opened the Maccabæan flood-gates. Are we now to be deluged with Maccabæan productions?

It is impossible to judge with fairness the work of the different hands which Siegfried assumes to have tampered with the original poem. Though he has, in nearly every case, followed earlier critics, it is only just that final judgment should be suspended until the appearance of the English translation. We shall there find the arguments upon which these distinctions are based. But may I not, even here, be allowed to express a slight doubt as to the passages designated "parallel compositions"? Upon what authority other than a purely subjective feeling can Siegfried base his corrections? There is little possibility of proving them upon philological grounds, as is possible in proving the dual authorship of Isaiah, or the poly-authorship of the Hexateuch. Merx had a strophical theory, which he could use as a dissecting knife, and cut off all excrescences. Bickell has some hold in his reconstructed LXX. Siegfried will have neither of these. Perhaps he has a third. He will have difficulty in justifying his exclusion of vii. 1-10, or of the greater part of chap. xiv. (which latter, with the exclusion of a few later additions, can very well be kept in its place). The case is a little different with chapters xl. 6 to xlii. 6. There are so many internal reasons which weigh against the authenticity of the passage that one is readily tempted to follow Siegfried in excluding it altogether. Despite the arguments lately brought forward by Grill (*Komposition des Buches Hiob*, pp. 67, *sq.*), and Dillmann (*Hiob*, Fourth Ed.), xl. 6-14+xlii. 1-6, can hardly be saved by finding the theme in xl. 8.

I have gone over very carefully some fifteen chapters in Siegfried's text, and find that he has incorporated nearly all the good suggestions made by his predecessors. His edition may be said to contain a corrected Masoretic text—corrected with the help of the old versions only where there seems to be an evident mistake in the tradition, or where the *textus receptus* yields no appreciable sense.

This seems to be the only possible course with the Book of Job. Cornill, in his reconstruction of Ezekiel, was able to follow a more scientific method, and to give us a text based upon a continued comparison of all the witnesses. In the chapters which I have gone over I have noted the following suggestions:—

iii. 12. Why is v. 16 not inserted between vv. 12 and 13, in which place it evidently belongs (Reiske, Hoffmann)? If allowed to remain in the Masoretic order, אֵל ought to be omitted (Bickell, following the Sahidic version).

iv. 6. It is a simpler change—I would say also, better Hebrew—to write ותקוּתך תם דרכיך (Reiske, Hoffmann, Bickell).

iv. 10, 11 are relegated to the margin. It is difficult to see why. Merx pleads his “Strophen-Theorie.”

iv. 15. Why change תִּכְמֹר in the meaning “Cause to stand up?” There is a good parallel in the Assyrian expression *Šarat zumrišu ušzizu*, vide Rawl., 50, 51/52a, cited by Delitzsch, *Wörterbuch*, p. 253, and Hagen, in the *Beiträge zur Assyriologie*, II. p. 232; J. D. Prince, *Mene Mene Tekel Upharsin* (Baltimore, 1893), p. 82, has correctly translated this, “one the the hair of whose body the evil one has caused to stand up.”

iv. 19. In notes the *P(eshitta)* should have been cited, which reads, נִתְמַנְכוּ = יִדְבְּאוּם. So also v. 4.

iv. 21. Here also P. should have been cited: מָנָה וֵן. v. 3, P., וְאִבְדָּא = וּרְקָב?

v. 1. The reason given in the note for omitting this verse is very weak.

v. 11. Note. P. reads בְּפִוּרְקָנָא. The similar reading in the Syro-Hexapla is of Symmachus.

v. 27. The change to שְׂמַעְנָה is unnecessary, and is not required by חִקְרֵבוּהָ. P. = G. שְׂמַעְנָה.

vi. 4. The punctuation (ק) is unintelligible.

vi. 8. The change is unnecessary. Cf. iv. 6.

vi. 13. In note add, P. עִירְיָנָה בִּי = עִוְרָתִי בִּי!

vi. 14. In note add, P., מִנֶּעַ = יִדְבְּלָא.

vi. 18. The change is unnecessary. Cp. Ruth iii. 8. P., נִתְעַרְקִלֹן. The Qal has a different meaning in the only passage in which it occurs, Jud. xvi. 29.

vi. 21. Note. Merx is wrongly credited with reading לִי. He reads לָא. G., μολ. P., עָלִי. It is more than questionable whether לִי can be translated “against me.” Nor is Hoffmann’s “Nun, da ihr darüber gerathen sind” (לו), any better.

vii. 20. Siegfried should have mentioned that עָלִי is expressly stated to be a *Tiqqūn Soferim*. Cp. Geiger, *Urschrift*, pp. 310 sq., *Hebraica*, 1887, p. 244.

ix. 19. Note, add P., וְאִרְעִינָה. G., αὐτοῦ.

ix. 27. The change to אִמְרָתִי (also Hoffmann and Bickell) is unnecessary.

Even Driver, *Use of the Tenses in Hebrew*, 3rd ed., p. 176 (note), has some doubts. See the passages which he cites.

ix. 28. The change to אַבְלָאָה פָּנִי is unnecessary. Cf. x. 20, ψ xxxix. 14.

ix. 32. Bickell reads יֵשׁ כְּמוֹנִי אֶעֱנֶנּוּ לֹי, which is good.

x. 8. P. has a double translation. ולְמַטְבְּעוֹתָבִי (L. præcipitas me) would support Siegfried's טַבֵּל; yet the correction is unnecessary. But G., $\mu\epsilon\rho\acute{\alpha}$ ταῦτα, P., בַּתְּרֵכֶן = אַחֵר; Bickell, אַחֵר סִפֵּךְ תְּבַלְעֵנִי.

xii. 2. חֲמוּת is quite intelligible. Why should such a reading be called "clever"? A. and S. merely render M. a little more freely. It is also the reading of P. and T.

xii. 4. The same may be said of רָעָהוּ: *I am become as one who is a laughing-stock to his fellows*, which answers both objections.

xii. 25. Read, with G., $\pi\lambda\alpha\nu\theta\epsilon\iota\eta\sigma\alpha\nu$, וַיִּתְּעוּ (so Bickell).

xv. 24. Note. Hoffmann translated "blitzen" (which is not *ready to attack*).

xv. 31. Siegfried reads נִתְעַב בְּבִשְׁתִּי נִתְעַב—a very bold correction, considering that nothing whatever has been mentioned about idolatry. The single reference to בְּתִעַב, v. 16, is very weak. I wonder that Siegfried did not pry a little further and land in v. 27. P. leads the way in reading כִּימָה and כְּסִיל (Job ix. 9; xxxviii. 31). Hoffmann formerly (*Z. A. W.*, III. p. 107) followed P. But in his *Hioh* (Kiel, 1891) he has given up this interpretation. Here he suggests פִּימָה = פִּפְיָא! But there is no need to change a letter. Read פִּימָה, and cf. ψ , lviii. 7. The verb עָשָׂה is used of parts of the body in 2 Sam. xix. 25, in a general sense: "put in order, prepare." What עָשָׂה פִי may mean, we see from the Assyrian *ipisu pa*, which occurs so often in the sense "Open the mouth, speak." Cf. *Nimrod Epos*, ed. Haupt, Tab. VI., l. 22; Tab. IX., ll. 31, 164, 167, etc. *B. O. R.*, vol. VI. 5, 6; Jeremias, *Babylonisch-Assyrische Vorstellung vom Leben nach dem Tode*, p. 26; Delitzsch, *Assyrische Studien*, p. 21 (שִׁמָּה בַּפִּיהֶם, Deut. xxxviii. 19, is a little different). This conditions, also, the translation of the first clause. The expression כִּסָּה פָּנִים may be compared with פָּנֵי שֹׁפְטִיָּה יִכְסֶה, "die Richter parteiisch machen," Job ix. 24 (Siegfried-Stade, s.v., כִּסָּה). בְּחִלָּבוֹ may be equivalent to "with his sacrifices." On the prominent part which the חֶלֶב played in the sacrificial ritual, see such passages as Gen. iv. 4, Exod. xxiii. 18 (Wellhausen, *Geschichte Israels*, p. 73), Lev. iii. 16, 17, and cf. Robertson Smith, *Religion of the Semites*, pp. 230, 364. The meaning of the verse would then be: *he has endeavoured to propitiate him with his sacrifice, and has addressed himself in prayer to K'sil*. The בְּתִים, in v. 29, would fall in with this idea. Then Siegfried's בִּשְׁתִּי might have some meaning.

xv. 32. There is no contradiction evident here. It may be necessary to punctuate הִמְלִיא (Is. xl. 2, Gen. xxix. 21). בְּלֹא יוֹמוֹ means "before its time is come," i.e., it dies young. Cp. Eccl. vii. 17, and נִנְלָתִי בִל עָמִי, in line 2 of the Esmunazar inscription (*C. I. S.*, vol. I., plate 2). The

subject of תמלא is תמורתו (according to Hoffmann's excellent emendation, who very properly refers to xiv. 7). This agrees well with כפחו, in v. 32.

xv. 34. A community can very well be *hard as stone*, according to the figure of speech used here. It is childless, i.e., *dies out* (Is. xl. 21 — שכולה). The question might as well be asked of לילה, iii. 7.

I break off here, as this notice has already become too long. In such a difficult book as is Job, it is natural that opinions should vary greatly. It is unfortunate that the plan of the work permits of so little space being given up to the notes. I am sure that Professor Siegfried has made a complete collation of all the "witnesses" to the text. Would it not be a good thing for the Editor of each part to publish his prolegomena in some magazine? A conspectus like that in Workman's Jeremiah would be very valuable.

The typographical work on this part shows great care and foresight. It is a pity that the book was somewhat hurried in passing through the Press. Both Professor Siegfried and Professor Haupt are usually so exact and painstaking in such matters that it is a surprise to see so large a list of *additions and corrections* (page 50). It is especially annoying that the colouring of two passages (x. 18-22, and page 167. note β) has been omitted in the text.

Professor Haupt is to be congratulated upon the appearance of this first part of his great undertaking. I hope that the other parts will follow in quick succession.

RICHARD GOTTHEIL.

Columbia College, in the City of
New York, January 26th, 1894.

On the Masorah.

Aus Masorah und Talmudkritik. Exegetical Studies by BERNHARD KOENIGSBERGER. Part I.: Introduction. § 1. The "dotted" passages; § 2. Concerning the "inverted" Nun; § 3. The "suspended" letters. Berlin: Mayer and Müller. 1892.

THE work before us follows most closely my *Masoretische Untersuchungen*, which appeared in 1891, and deals with the materials contained in the first four chapters. There is indeed so close a connection between the two, that the deductions made by the author